



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/637,078 08/11/2000		Erik R Altman	YOR9-2000-0415US1 (8728-4	8733	
46069	7590 04/06/2005		EXAMINER		
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD		WOOD, WILLIAM H			
	7, NY 11797		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2193		
			DATE MAIL ED. 04/06/2000	DATE MAIL ED. 04/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	, .
09/637,078	ALTMAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
William H. Wood	2124-2193	

	**************************************	4143	<b>'</b>
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence	address
THE REPLY FILED 25 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amenda condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appearamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The a)</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	a Notice of Appeal. To avoid aban ment, affidavit, or other evidence, al fee) in compliance with 37 CFR e reply must be filed within one of	idonment of this a which places the 41.31; or (3) a Re	application, applicant application in equest for Continued
b) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date  b) no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70		E FIRST REPLY W	AS FILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The application of the final of	propriate extension fee
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appe was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41 Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 C has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time peri	1.37 must be filed within two month FR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	ns of the date of fi	iling the Notice of
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the contract of the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the contract of the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection (s) filed after a final rejection (s) filed after a fil</li></ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ed because
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplify	ying the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally re	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendr	ent (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		•	,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amer	idment canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will will will will will will be will will will will will will will wil	Il be entered and	an explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-16,18-30 and 32-42</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
B.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal water or other eviden	ill <u>not</u> be entered ice is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellar See 37 CFR 41.33	nt fails to provide a 8(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or a	ttached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but Applicant's arguments were not persuasive. Applicant a plurality of events for profiling". Krishnaswamy reveals the has incorrectly ignored the phrase "programmable to concount various events"). Applicant further argues Krishnagain incorrectly ignores the word "programmable" and for Krishnaswamy is inoperable. All other arguments have to the programmable of the programmable of the programmable.	rgues Krishnaswamy fails to disclonis limitation in column 6, lines 24- unt events like" in the prior art (or part of the prior art of the part of the prior art of the part of the	ose "selecting at li- -28 specifically ar ohrased another v y out a selectable	east one of a nd directly. Applicant way "adjustable to e operation. This is
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	10(s)	
13. Other:	V OKA	KALI CHAKI	Man,

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100